arXiv:1703.09056v1 [quant-ph] 27 Mar 2017

Precision bounds for gradient magnetometry with atomic ensembles

Iagoba Apellaniz,[1,*] Iñigo Urizar-Lanz,[1] Zoltán Zimborás,[1,2,3] Philipp Hyllus,[1] and Géza Tóth[1,3,4,†]

[1]*Department of Theoretical Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, P. O. Box 644, E-48080 Bilbao, Spain*
[2]*Dahlem Center for Complex Quantum Systems, Freie Universität Berlin, 14195 Berlin, Germany*
[3]*Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 49, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary*
[4]*IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, E-48013 Bilbao, Spain*

(Dated: March 28, 2017)

We study gradient magnetometry with an ensemble of atoms with arbitrary spin. We consider the case of a very general spatial probability distribution function. We calculate precision bounds for estimating the gradient of the magnetic field based on the quantum Fisher information. For quantum states that are invariant under homogeneous magnetic fields, we need to measure a single observable to estimate the gradient. On the other hand, for states that are sensitive to homogeneous fields, the measurement of two observables are needed, as the homogeneous field must also be estimated. This leads to a two-parameter estimation problem. We present a method to calculate precision bounds for gradient estimation with a chain of atoms or with two spatially separated atomic ensembles feeling different magnetic fields. We also consider a single atomic ensemble with an arbitrary density profile, in which the atoms cannot be addressed individually, and which is a very relevant case for experiments. Our model can take into account even correlations between particle positions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Metrology plays an important role in many areas of physics and engineering [1]. With the development of experimental techniques, it is now possible to realize metrological tasks in physical systems that cannot be described well by classical physics and instead quantum mechanics must be used for their modelling. Quantum metrology [2–5] is the novel field that is concerned with metrology using such quantum mechanical systems.

One of the basic tasks of quantum metrology is magnetometry with an ensemble of spin-j particles. Magnetometry with a completely polarized state works as follows. The total spin of the ensemble is rotated by a homogeneous magnetic field perpendicular to it. We would like to estimate the rotation angle or phase θ based on some measurement; this phase parameter can then be used to obtain the field strength. To determine the rotation angle, one needs to measure a spin component perpendicular to the mean spin. The basic steps of the estimation process are illustrated in Fig. 1.

Up to now, it looks as if the total spin behaves like a clock arm and its position tells us the value of θ exactly. However, at this point one has to remember that we have an ensemble of N particles governed by quantum mechanics, and the uncertainty of the spin component perpendicular to the mean spin can never be zero. Hence, simple calculation shows that the scaling of the precision of the phase estimation is $(\Delta\theta)^{-2} \sim N$, which is called the *shot-noise scaling* [2–5]. Spin squeezing [6–10] can decrease the uncertainty of one of the components perpendicular to the mean spin and this can be used to increase the precision of the measurements [10]. However, while it is possible to surpass the shot-noise limit, no quantum state can have a larger scaling in the precision than the fundamental precision bound $(\Delta\theta)^{-2} \sim N^2$, called the *Heisenberg scaling* for the case of a linear Hamiltonian [2–5].



FIG. 1. Basic steps of the estimation process. The initial state ρ suffers a θ-dependent evolution represented by Λ_θ. M is measured for the final state ρ_θ, and the phase θ is estimated from the results.

In recent years, quantum metrology has been applied in many scenarios, from atomic clocks [11–13] and precision magnetometry [14–20] to gravitational wave detectors [21–23]. However, so far most of the attention has been paid to the problem of estimating a single parameter. The case of multi-parameter estimation for quantum systems is much less studied, possibly, since it can be more complicated due to the non-commutative nature of the problem [24–32].

In this paper, one of the most fundamental two-parameter estimation tasks in magnetometry is considered, namely gradient magnetometry [33]. We compute the bounds for the estimation of the magnetic field gradient. In general in order to achieve these bounds, an estimate of the constant (homogeneous) part of the field is required. Magnetometry of this type can be realized with differential interferometry with two particle ensembles, which has raised a lot of attention in quantum metrology [15, 34–39]. Another possibility is considering spin chains, which can be relevant in trapped cold ions or optical lattices of cold atoms, where we have individual access to the particles [40–42]. Finally, gradient magnetometry can be carried out using a single atomic cloud, which is very relevant from the point of view of cold gas experiments. While most works in magnetometry with a single ensemble focus only on the determination of the strength and direction of the magnetic field, certain measurement schemes for the gradient have already been proposed and tested experimentally. Some schemes use an imaging of the ensemble with a high spatial resolution, however, they do not count as single-ensemble methods in the sense we use this expression in our paper, since in this case not only collective observables are measured [18–20]. There is a method based on collective measurements of the spin length of a fully polarized ensemble [43]. Finally, there is a scheme based on many-body singlet states described

* iagoba.apellaniz@gmail.com
† toth@alumni.nd.edu;
URL: http://www.gtoth.eu

in Ref. [40]. Our paper provides precision bounds for that scheme, while extending the quantum states considered to several interesting quantum states, including those that are not invariant under homogeneous fields.

We can write the field at the atoms, situated along the x-axis with $y = z = 0$ as

$$\boldsymbol{B}(x, 0, 0) = \boldsymbol{B}_0 + x\boldsymbol{B}_1 + \mathcal{O}(x^2), \tag{1}$$

where we neglect the terms of order two or higher, and where $\mathcal{O}(\xi)$ is the usual Landau notation to describe the asymptotic behavior of a quantity, in this case for small ξ. We consider the magnetic field pointing along the z-direction, $\boldsymbol{B}_0 = B_0 \cdot (0, 0, 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{B}_1 = B_1 \cdot (0, 0, 1)$. For this configuration, due to the Maxwell equations, with no currents or changing electric fields, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{B} &= 0, \\ \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{B} &= (0, 0, 0). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

This implies $\sum_{l=x,y,z} \partial B_l/\partial l = 0$ and $\partial B_l/\partial m - \partial B_m/\partial l = 0$ for $l \neq m$. Thus, the spatial derivatives of the field components are not independent of each other. However, in the case of a linear chain only the derivative along the chain has an influence on the quantum dynamics of the atoms. A similar statement holds for a quasi one-dimensional atomic ensemble, which is typically the case if we consider an elongated trap.

We determine the precision bounds for the estimation of the magnetic field gradient B_1. Several arrangements of the atoms are considered. For these setups, we calculate how the precision scales with the the number of particles. We compare systems with an increasing particle number, but of the same size. As discussed later, if we follow a different route, we can obtain super-Heisenberg scaling.

First, we consider spin chains and two particle ensembles at different positions. The gradient measurement with these systems is essentially based on the idea that the gradient is just the difference between two measurements at different locations. With these systems, it is possible to reach the Heisenberg scaling.

We also examine in detail the case of a single atomic ensemble. Since in such systems the atoms cannot be individually addressed, we assume that the quantum state is permutationally invariant (PI). We show that for states insensitive to the homogeneous magnetic field, one can reduce the problem to a one-parameter estimation scenario. The Heisenberg limit cannot be reached with such systems. For states sensitive to the homogeneous field, the classical limit can be overcome only if the particle positions are highly correlated with each other. Nevertheless, even if the precision is not better than the shot-noise limit, single-ensemble measurements have certain advantages because the spatial resolution can be higher and the experimental requirements are smaller since only a single ensemble must be prepared.

We use quantum Fisher information (QFI) in our derivations [4, 44–48]. Due to this, our calculations are generally valid for any measurement, thus they are relevant to many recent experiments [14–20, 43]. We note that in the case of the spin singlet, our precision bounds are saturated by the metrological scheme presented in Ref. [40].

We can also connect our results to entanglement theory [49–51]. We find that the shot-noise scaling cannot be surpassed with separable states, while the Heisenberg scaling can be reached with entangled states. However, as already mentioned,the shot-noise scaling can be surpassed only if the particle positions are correlated, which is the case, for instance, if the particles attract each other.

Next, we present the main characteristics of our setup. For simplicity, as well as following recent experiments (e.g., Ref. [18]), we consider an ensemble of spin-j particles placed in a one-dimensional setup, x being the spatial coordinate. Furthermore, we assume that we have particles that behave classically with respect to their spatial state. That is, they cannot be in a superposition of being in two different positions. On the other hand, they have internal degrees of freedom, their spin, which is quantum. This is a very good description to many of the cold gas experiments.

Based on these considerations, we assume that the state is factorizable into a spatial part and a spin part as

$$\rho = \rho^{(\mathrm{x})} \otimes \rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, \tag{3}$$

where the internal state is decomposed in its eigenbasis as $\rho^{(\mathrm{s})} = \sum_\lambda p_\lambda |\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda|$. For the spatial part defined in the continuous Hilbert space, we assume that it can be modeled by an incoherent mixture of point-like particles as

$$\rho^{(\mathrm{x})} = \int \frac{P(\boldsymbol{x})}{\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle} |\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\langle\boldsymbol{x}| \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \tag{4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N)$ is a vector which collects all the particle positions, $P(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the spatial probability distribution function (PDF) of the atoms, and $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$ denotes $\mathrm{d}x_1 \, \mathrm{d}x_2 \cdots \mathrm{d}x_N$. Note that the spatial part, Eq. (4), is diagonal in the position eigenbasis, which simplifies considerably our calculations, see Appendix A for more details. During the evolution of the state, correlations might arise between the internal and the spatial parts and the product form Eq. (3) might be not valid to describe the evolution of the system [52].

Although in our case the parameter to be estimated is B_1, the time-evolution of the state is usually also affected by the second unknown parameter, the homogeneous field B_0, which means that we generally have to consider a two-parameter estimation problem. The angular momentum of an individual atom is coupled to the magnetic field, yielding the following interaction term

$$h^{(n)} = \gamma B_z^{(n)} \otimes j_z^{(n)}, \tag{5}$$

where the operator $B_z^{(n)} = B_0 + B_1 \hat{x}^{(n)}$ acts on the spatial part of the Hilbert space, and $\hat{x}^{(n)}$ is the position operator of a single particle, acting on the spin part of the Hilbert space. We use the " $\hat{}$ " notation to avoid confusion, later we will omit it if possible. The Hamiltonian is just the sum of all two-particle interactions of the type Eq. (5) provide the total Hamiltonian

$$H = \gamma \sum_{n=1}^{N} B_z^{(n)} \otimes j_z^{(n)}, \tag{6}$$

which generates the evolution on time of the atomic ensemble.

We calculate lower bounds on the precision of estimating B_1 based on a measurement on the state after it passed through the unitary dynamics $U = \exp(-i\frac{H}{\hbar}t)$, where t is the time spent by the system under the influence of the magnetic field. The unitary operator can be rewritten as

$$U = e^{-i(b_0 H_0 + b_1 H_1)}, \tag{7}$$

where the $b_i = \gamma B_i t/\hbar$. Here, the generator describing the effect of the homogeneous field is given as

$$H_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{N} j_z^{(n)} = J_z, \tag{8}$$

while the generator describing the effect of the gradient is

$$H_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{N} x^{(n)} j_z^{(n)}. \tag{9}$$

We omit $\otimes$ and the superscripts (x) and (s) for simplicity, and use them only if it is necessary to avoid confusions.

The operators H_0 and H_1 commute with each other. However, it is not necessarily true that the operators we have to measure to estimate b_0 or b_1 can be simultaneously measured. The reason for that is that both operators to be measured act on the same atomic ensemble. We consider this case by case. On the other hand, in schemes in which the gradient is calculated based on measurements in two separate atomic ensembles or different atoms in a chain, the measuring operators can always commute with each other [14, 15, 41].

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, the basic concepts used in the paper are presented. In Sec. III, we compute precision bounds for relevant spatial configurations appearing in cold atom physics such as spin chains and two ensembles spatially separated from each other. In Sec. IV, we consider a single atomic ensemble in a PI state and we calculate the precision bounds for various quantum states, such as the singlet spin state or the totally polarized state. In Sec. V, we discuss our results.

II. CRAMÉR-RAO PRECISION BOUNDS

In this section, we show how the Cramér-Rao bound and the QFI help us to obtain the precision bound that is valid for any measurement scenario. We discuss gradient magnetometry using quantum states that are insensitive to homogeneous fields. In this case, we need to estimate only the gradient and do not have to know the homogeneous field. Hence, this case corresponds to a single-parameter estimation problem. Then, we discuss the case of quantum states sensitive to homogeneous fields. Since gradient estimation with such states is a two-parameter estimation task, we introduce the two-parameter Cramér-Rao bound and the corresponding two-parameter QFI matrix, and we adapt those expressions to our problem. We show also that the precision bound obtained does not change under spatial translation, which will be used later to simplify our calculations.

Next, we summarize important properties of the quantum Fisher information, used throughout this paper. Let us consider a quantum state with the eigendecomposition

$$\rho = \sum_k \lambda_k |k\rangle\langle k|. \tag{10}$$

For two arbitrary generators A and B and a state ρ, (10), the quantum Fisher information is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A, B] := 2\sum_{k,k'} \frac{(p_k - p_{k'})^2}{p_k + p_{k'}} A_{k,k'} B_{k',k}, \tag{11}$$

where $A_{k,k'} = \langle k|A|k'\rangle$ and $B_{k,k'} = \langle k|B|k'\rangle$. If the two operators are the same then the usual form of the QFI is obtained [4]

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A] \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A, A] = 2\sum_{k,k'} \frac{(p_k - p_{k'})^2}{p_k + p_{k'}} |A_{k,k'}|^2. \tag{12}$$

We mention that in our case the generators A and B commute making the computations easier.

We list some useful properties of the QFI:

(i) Based on Eq. (11), $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A, B]$ is linear in the second and third arguments

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, \textstyle\sum_i A_i, \sum_j B_j] = \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A_i, B_j]. \tag{13}$$

(ii) It remains invariant if we exchange the second and the third arguments,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A, B] = \mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, B, A]. \tag{14}$$

(iii) The following alternative form,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, A, B] = 4\langle AB\rangle - 8\sum_{k,k'} \frac{p_k p_{k'}}{p_k + p_{k'}} A_{k,k'} B_{k',k}, \tag{15}$$

is also useful.

(iv) For pure states, Eq. (11) simplifies to

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|\psi\rangle, A, B] = 4\left(\langle AB\rangle_\psi - \langle A\rangle_\psi \langle B\rangle_\psi\right). \tag{16}$$

From Eq. (16), we obtain that the quantum Fisher information for $A{=}B$ and for pure states equals four times the variance, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|\psi\rangle, A] = 4(\Delta A)^2$[4, 44–48].

(v) The QFI is convex in the space of the density matrices, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[p\rho_1 + (1-p)\rho_2] \leqslant p\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho_1] + (1-p)\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho_2], \tag{17}$$

where we omitted writing the second and third arguments for simplicity.

In the following, we show the general form of the expression giving the precision bounds for states insensitive to the homogeneous field and for states sensitive to it. We consider spatial states of the type Eq. (4). We also show that both bounds are invariant under the spatial translation of the system which makes the computing for particular cases much easier.

A. Precision bound for states insensitive to homogeneous fields: Single-parameter dependence

Let us consider quantum states that are insensitive to the homogeneous field, $[\rho, H_0] = 0$. Hence, the evolved state is a function of a single unknown parameter, b_1.

Observation 1.— For states of the form given in Eqs. (3) and (4), and for which $[\rho, H_0] = 0$, the maximal precision of the estimation of the gradient parameter b_1 is given as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}|_{\max} = \sum_{n,m}^{N} \int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\, {\rm d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm s)}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}], \tag{18}$$

where the integral represents the correlation between the particle positions x_n and x_m. Moreover, Eq.(18) is translationally

invariant, i.e., it remains the same after an arbitrary displacement d of the form of

$$U_d = \exp(-idP_x), \tag{19}$$

where d is the distance displaced and P_x is the sum of all single body momentum operators $p_x^{(n)}$ on the x-direction.

Proof. The QFI for single-parameter estimation can be expressed in terms of the eigen-decomposition of the density matrix of the type (10) as [4, 44–48]

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_1] = 2\sum_{k,k'} \frac{(p_k - p_{k'})^2}{p_k + p_{k'}} |(H_1)_{k,k'}|^2. \tag{20}$$

Using the Cramér-Rao bound, the precision is written as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}|_{\max} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_1]. \tag{21}$$

It is always possible to find a measurement that saturates the precision bound, (21), which is indicated using the notation "$|_{\max} =$".

For the particular case where the state is written as Eqs. (3) and (4), the eigenbasis of the state is given by $|\boldsymbol{x}, \lambda\rangle$, where $|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle$ and $|\lambda\rangle$ are defined in the spatial and internal Hilbert spaces, respectively. The matrix elements of H_1, which is diagonal in the spatial subspace, are obtained in this basis as

$$\begin{aligned}(H_1)_{\boldsymbol{x},\lambda;\boldsymbol{y},\nu} &= \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \lambda | H_1 | \boldsymbol{y}, \nu \rangle \\ &= \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \lambda | \sum_{n=1}^{N} x^{(n)} j^{(n)} | \boldsymbol{y}, \nu \rangle \\ &= \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}) \langle \lambda | \sum_{n=1}^{N} x_n j^{(n)} | \nu \rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Then, we use the Dirac delta function appearing in Eq. (22) and that the state is diagonal in the spatial Hilbert space Eq. (4), to obtain Eq. (18) from Eq. (20). For details of the simplification see the Appendix B.

In the last part of the proof we show that the precision Eq. (18) remains the same for any displacement of the system. We use the Heisenberg picture in which the operators must be transformed instead of the states. H_1 after the displacement is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}H_1(d) = U_d H_1 U_d^\dagger &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} U_d x^{(n)} U_d^\dagger \otimes j_z^{(n)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} (x^{(n)} - d) j_z^{(n)} \\ &= H_1 - d H_0.\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Hence, instead of Eq. (7), we have to consider the unitary evolution operator

$$U(d) = e^{-i(b_0 H_0 + b_1 H_1(d))} = e^{-i((b_0 - b_1 d) H_0 + b_1 H_1)} \tag{24}$$

Using $[\rho, H_0] = 0$, we can simplify both Eqs. (7) and (24) to $U = e^{-i b_1 H_1}$. With this we conclude the proof of the Observation 1. ■

B. Precision bound for states sensitive to homogeneous fields: Two-parameter dependence

In order to obtain the precision bound for states sensitive to the homogeneous field, one has to consider the effect of a second unknown parameter, b_0. The homogeneous field rotates all the spins in the same way, while the field gradient rotates the spins differently depending on the position of the particles. Now, instead of the Cramér-Rao bound, (21), we have a matrix inequality, the 2×2 QFI matrix $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ on the one hand, which depends on ρ and the two generators H_0 and H_1, and the covariance matrix from which we are only interested on the variance of the gradient parameter, $(\Delta b_1)^2$ [4].

The QFI matrix elements are computed as $\mathcal{F}_{ij} := \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_i, H_j]$, following the definition (11). The precision of the gradient estimation is bounded as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2} \leqslant \mathcal{F}_{11} - \frac{\mathcal{F}_{01}\mathcal{F}_{10}}{\mathcal{F}_{00}}. \tag{25}$$

The bound (25) is interpreted slightly differently compared to the one-parameter case Eq. (20). First of all, Eq. (25) only is valid if the state is sensitive to both parameters, b_0 and b_1, for which the QFI matrix is invertible. In this case, both b_0 and b_1 must be estimated, even if we are interested only in knowing b_1. In order to be able to saturate the bound in Eq. (25), the measurements for estimating both parameters must be compatible [4, 53]. Hence, we use "$\leqslant$" instead of "$|_{\max}$" for the bound until we prove that it can be saturated.

Next, we present the bound for gradient estimation for states that are sensitive to the homogeneous fields.

Observation 2.— For states sensitive to the homogeneous field of the form Eqs. (3) and (4), the expression to compute the precision bound for the gradient parameter takes the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} \leqslant &\sum_{n,m}^{N} \int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &- \frac{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} \int x_n P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, J_z]\right)^2}{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, J_z]}.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Moreover, the bound, (26), similarly to the Eq. (18) is invariant under spatial translations of the system.

Proof. To compute the bound (26) we need to consider the matrix elements of QFI one by one. First of all, we compute $\mathcal{F}_{11}$ which has the same form as Eq. (18)

$$\mathcal{F}_{11} = \sum_{n,m}^{N} \int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}]. \tag{27}$$

Next, we have that H_0, similarly to Eq. (22), is diagonal in the spatial $|x\rangle$ basis, and its matrix elements in the $|\boldsymbol{x}, \lambda\rangle$ basis of the state are written as

$$\begin{aligned}(H_0)_{\boldsymbol{x},\lambda;\boldsymbol{y},\nu} &= \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \lambda | H_0 | \boldsymbol{y}, \nu \rangle \\ &= \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \lambda | \sum_{n=1}^{N} j_z^{(n)} | \boldsymbol{y}, \nu \rangle \\ &= \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}) \langle \lambda | \sum_{n=1}^{N} j_z^{(n)} | \nu \rangle\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

and with this we obtain $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_0, H_0]$ as

$$\mathcal{F}_{00} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, J_z]. \tag{29}$$

Note that Eq.(29) is not a function of the whole state but only of the internal $\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}$ state. Finally, we compute $\mathcal{F}_{01}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{10}$.

Noting that $\mathcal{F}_{01} = \mathcal{F}_{10}$, we have to compute only one of them. Using Eqs. (28) and (22) for the matrix elements of H_0 and H_1 respectively, we compute the $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_0, H_1]$ as

$$\mathcal{F}_{01} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int x_n P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, J_z]. \tag{30}$$

With these results the Eq. (26) follows. See Appendix B for more details.

For the last part of the proof, we need to show that the bound is invariant under translations as it is the case in Eq. (18). With this aim, using the linearity of the last two arguments of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, A, B]$, Eq. (13), the fact that H_0 remains unchanged in the Heisenberg picture and using the shifted H_1 operator (23) we arrive at the relations

$$\mathcal{F}_{00}(d) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_0(d)] = \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_0], \tag{31a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{01}(d) &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_0(d), H_1(d)] \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_0, H_1 - dH_0] = \mathcal{F}_{01} - d\mathcal{F}_{00},\end{aligned} \tag{31b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{11}(d) &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_1(d), H_1(d)] \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, H_1 - dH_0, H_1 - dH_0] \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{11} - 2d\mathcal{F}_{01} + d^2\mathcal{F}_{00},\end{aligned} \tag{31c}$$

for all matrix elements of the QFI. Simple algebra shows that the bound for a displaced system equals to the original bound

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} &\leqslant \mathcal{F}_{11}(d) - \frac{(\mathcal{F}_{01}(d))^2}{\mathcal{F}_{00}(d)} \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{11} - 2d\mathcal{F}_{01} + d^2\mathcal{F}_{00} \\ &\quad - \frac{\mathcal{F}_{01}^2 - 2d\mathcal{F}_{01}\mathcal{F}_{00} + d^2\mathcal{F}_{00}^2}{\mathcal{F}_{00}} \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{11} - \frac{\mathcal{F}_{01}^2}{\mathcal{F}_{00}}.\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Hence, the Observation 1 holds. ■

Observation 1 makes the computation of the next sections easier since now we can place the system without changing the precision bound of the gradient estimation. For instance, we can place the system at the point where the magnetic field is zero. The previous derivations also helped us to understand gradient metrology with the physical system we consider.

III. SPIN CHAIN AND TWO SEPARATED ENSEMBLES FOR MAGNETOMETRY

After presenting our tools in Sec. II, we start with simple examples to show how our method works. We consider two cases, a chain of particles along the x-direction, and two ensembles of particles separated by a distance. We show how one can obtain precision bounds for gradient metrology, based on knowing the spatial state of the system.

As we have said, the first spatial state we consider is given by N particles placed equidistantly one from each other in a one-dimensional spin chain, i.e., a chain of atoms in a 1D lattice [39], shown in Figure III. The probability density function describing such a system is

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \delta(x_n - na). \tag{33}$$



FIG. 2. A one-dimensional chain of 6 spin-j atoms (blue circles) confined in a potential (grey area). (a) The ensemble is initially totally polarized along the y direction perpendicular to the magnetic field B_z, pointing outward from the figure, and to the direction of the chain, i.e., the x-direction. The internal state can be written as $|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}$, where the number represents m_y the eigenvalue of the one particle operator $j_y^{(n)}$. (b) If the magnetic field has a nonzero gradient, then it affects the spins of the individual atoms differently depending on the position of the atoms.

In this case we have to take into account that adding more particles to the system could improve the precision simply because the system is longer in the x direction and therefore more sensitive to the gradient parameter.

We compute the single-point averages and the two-point correlation corresponding to the PDF Eq. (33). For the average position of each particle we obtain

$$\int x_n P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = na, \tag{34}$$

whereas the two-point average is

$$\int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = nma^2. \tag{35}$$

We now list the collective averages. The mean particle position is

$$\mu = \int \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} x_n}{N} P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \tag{36}$$

while the standard deviation of the particle positions, describing the size of the system, is computed as

$$\sigma^2 = \int \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} x_n^2}{N} P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \mu^2. \tag{37}$$

Finally, the average covariance between different particles

$$\eta = \int \frac{\sum_{n\neq m}^{N} x_n x_m}{N(N-1)} P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \mu^2. \tag{38}$$

After introducing various important quantities describing the distribution of the particles, we use them to obtain precision bounds for particles places in a spin chain.

Observation 3.— Let us consider a chain (ch) of N spin-j particles placed along the x direction separated by a constant distance, and a magnetic field pointing in the z direction. Then, for the spin-state totally polarized in the y direction, $|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}$, the precision bound is given by

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2} \leqslant 2\sigma_{\mathrm{ch}}^2 N j, \tag{39}$$

where σ_{ch} denotes the standard deviation of the average position of the particles.

Proof. We are going to compute the precision bound when the internal state is a product state of all particles pointing onto y-direction, $|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}$, which is a state sensitive to the homogeneous field, so from Eq. (26) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} &\leqslant \sum_{n,m}^{N} nma^2 \mathcal{F}_{\text{Q}}[|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &\quad - \frac{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} an\mathcal{F}_{\text{Q}}[|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}, j_z^{(n)}, J_z]\right)^2}{\mathcal{F}_{\text{Q}}[|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}, J_z, J_z]} \\ &= a^2\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 2n^2 j - \frac{(\sum_{n=1}^{N} 2nj)^2}{2Nj}\right\} \\ &= 2a^2\frac{N^2-1}{12}Nj,\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where we have used the Eq. (16) defined for pure states.

Note that the bound, (40), seems to scale with the third power of the particle number N, and hence seems to overcome the ultimate Heisenberg limit. The reason is that the length of the chain increases as we introduce more particles into the system. We should compare the metrological usefulness of systems with different particle numbers, but of the same size. In our case we use in all results the standard deviation of the averaged particle positions as a measure of the spatial size of the system, and normalize the results with it. For the case of the chain we obtain the standard deviation defined in Eq.(37) as

$$\sigma_{\text{ch}}^2 = a^2\frac{N^2-1}{12}. \tag{41}$$

It turns out that this exactly coincides with a factor we have in Eq. (40), with which we conclude the proof. ■

After the spin chain, the second illustrative example we consider estimating the gradient with two particle ensembles. Two ensembles of spin-j atoms spatially separated from each other have been realized in cold gases (e.g., Ref. [54]), and can be used for differential interferometry [15, 34, 39]. We study an internal state with the maximal QFI so the reader becomes familiar with our approach and sees how the best state to measure the gradient parameter looks like in our framework.

We consider the case, where half of the particles are at one position and the rest at another one, both places at a distance of a from the origin. The probability density function of the spatial part is

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}) = \prod_{n=1}^{N/2}\delta(x_n + a)\prod_{n=N/2+1}^{N}\delta(x_n - a). \tag{42}$$

Such a distribution of particles could be realized in a double-well trap, where the width of the wells is negligible compared to the distance of the wells. To distinguish the two wells we use the labels "L" and "R" for the left-hand-side and right-hand-side wells, respectively. Based on these, we are able to compute the single-point and two-point correlation functions as

$$\int x_n P(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \begin{cases} -a & \text{if } n \in \text{L}, \\ +a & \text{if } n \in \text{R}, \end{cases} \tag{43a}$$

$$\int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \begin{cases} +a^2 & \text{if } (n,m) \in \text{(L,L) or (R,R)}, \\ -a^2 & \text{if } (n,m) \in \text{(L,R) or (L,R)}. \end{cases} \tag{43b}$$

Next, we calculate the precision of the gradient estimation that can be achieved by in the double well systems for various quantum states.

Observation 4.— The state that maximizes the QFI for the two ensemble case is GHZ-like state of N spin-j particles defined as

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{|j\cdots j\rangle^{(\text{L})}|-j\cdots -j\rangle^{(\text{R})} + |-j\cdots -j\rangle^{(\text{L})}|j\cdots j\rangle^{(\text{R})}}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{44}$$

The best achievable precision is given as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}|_{\max} = 4\sigma_{\text{dw}}^2 N^2 j^2, \tag{45}$$

since the state is insensitive to the Homogeneous field and where σ_{dw} is just the Eq. (37) computed for the spatial configuration of the double well (dw). Eq. (45) agrees with the results obtained before, see Ref. [34].

Proof. The state $|\psi\rangle$ is insensitive to the homogeneous field so we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2}|_{\max} &= \sum_{\substack{(n,m)= \\ \text{(L,L),(R,R)}}} a^2\mathcal{F}_{\text{Q}}[|\psi\rangle, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{(n,m)= \\ \text{(L,R),(R,L)}}} -a^2\mathcal{F}_{\text{Q}}[|\psi\rangle, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(n,m)= \\ \text{(L,L),(R,R)}}} a^2 j^2 + \sum_{\substack{(n,m)= \\ \text{(L,R),(R,L)}}} -a^2(-j^2) \\ &= 4a^2N^2j^2,\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where we have used the definition for pure states of Eq. (11).

Next, we compute the standard deviation as we did before for the case of the chain, (41). We find that $\mu = 0$ and the standard deviation for the spatial state is

$$\sigma_{\text{dw}}^2 = a^2, \tag{47}$$

with which the proof follows.

We now show an alternative proof. In this case, taking into account the particle locations and that we can place the origin where the magnetic field is zero without loss of generality, we obtain

$$H_{1,\text{eff}}^{(\text{s})} = a(\mathbb{1}^{(\text{L})}\otimes J_z^{(\text{R})} - J_z^{(\text{L})}\otimes\mathbb{1}^{(\text{R})}), \tag{48}$$

where we write the effective Hamiltonian that the particles feel and "L" and "R" stand for "left" and "right" Hilbert spaces respectively. Since the QFI is convex, we have to maximize $(\Delta H_{1,\text{eff}}^{(\text{s})})^2$ for some pure state. This proves that we have used the right state [34]. With this we conclude the proof. ■

Now that we have already introduced the case of the two ensembles, we show some more important results for states of the form of $|\psi\rangle^{(\text{L})}\otimes|\psi\rangle^{(\text{R})}$ [34]. These states can reach the Heisenberg limit, while they are easier to realize experimentally than states in which the particles on the left and particles

States in (L) and (R)	$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\varrho^{(\rm L)}, J_z^{(\rm L)}]$	$(\Delta b_1)^{-2} \leqslant$
$\|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N_{\rm L}} \otimes \|j\rangle_y^{\otimes N_{\rm L}}$	$2N_{\rm L}j$	$2a^2Nj$
$\|\Psi_{\rm sep}\rangle \otimes \|\Psi_{\rm sep}\rangle$	$4N_{\rm L}j^2$	$4a^2Nj^2$
$\|{\rm GHZ}\rangle \otimes \|{\rm GHZ}\rangle$	$N_{\rm L}^2$	$a^2N^2/2$
$\|{\rm D}_{N_{\rm L}}\rangle_x \otimes \|{\rm D}_{N_{\rm L}}\rangle_x$	$N_{\rm L}(N_{\rm L}+2)/2$	$a^2N(N+4)/4$

TABLE I. Precision for differential magnetometry for various product quantum states in two ensembles. Note that there are $N_{\rm L} = N/2$ particles in each ensemble. In the second column we show the QFI for the estimation of the homogeneous field appearing on the literature, for states with $N_{\rm L}$ particles. The third column shows the result for the bounds obtained with Eq. (49).

on the right are entangled with each other. From Eq. (48) for such states

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|\psi\rangle^{(\rm L)}|\psi\rangle^{(\rm R)}, a(\mathbb{1}^{(\rm L)}J_z^{(\rm R)} - J_z^{(\rm R)}\mathbb{1}^{(\rm L)})] = 2a^2\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|\psi\rangle^{(\rm L)}, J_z^{(\rm L)}], \quad (49)$$

where we used the general rule [55]

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm L)}\rho^{(\rm R)}, A^{(\rm L)}\mathbb{1}^{(\rm R)} + \mathbb{1}^{(\rm L)}A^{(\rm R)}, B^{(\rm L)}\mathbb{1}^{(\rm R)} + \mathbb{1}^{(\rm L)}B^{(\rm R)}] = \mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm L)}, A^{(\rm L)}, B^{(\rm L)}] + \mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm R)}, A^{(\rm R)}, B^{(\rm R)}], \quad (50)$$

for the Eq. (11). Note that this bound is obtained regardless of whether the state is sensitive or insensitive to the homogeneous field. The reader may note that this bound relates how good the states on "L" and "R" are in sensing the homogeneous field in its respective positions. This is reasonable because the state in "L" is not correlated with "R". Hence, after the homogeneous field is estimated for "L" and "R" independently, the gradient can also be estimated as the difference between the two estimates.

In the literature one can find several states that can be used to measure homogeneous fields. For qubits we have the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state [56]

$$|{\rm GHZ}\rangle = \frac{|00\cdots00\rangle + |11\cdots11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (51)$$

where $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are the one-particle eigenstates of $j_z^{(n)}$ with eigenvalues $-\frac{1}{2}$ and $+\frac{1}{2}$, respectively, or the unpolarized Dicke states

$$|{\rm D}_N\rangle_l = \binom{N}{N/2}^{-1/2} \sum_k \Pi_k(|0\rangle_l^{\otimes N/2} \otimes |1\rangle_l^{\otimes N/2}), \quad (52)$$

where $l = x, y, z$ and which are composed of an equal number of $|0\rangle_l$'s and $|1\rangle_l$'s and symmetrized afterwards summing for all Π_k permutations. Hence, based on the Eq. (49) in Table I, we summarized the precision bounds for states of the type $|\psi\rangle^{(\rm L)} \otimes |\psi\rangle^{(\rm R)}$ for the double well case.

IV. MAGNETOMETRY WITH A SINGLE ATOMIC ENSEMBLE

In this section, we discuss magnetometry with a single atomic ensemble in more detail. We consider a one-dimensional ensemble of spin-j atoms placed in a trap which is elongated in the x-direction. The setup is depicted in Fig. 3. In the last part of the section, we calculate precision bounds for the gradient estimation for some important multi-particle quantum states, for instance, Dicke states or GHZ states.



FIG. 3. An ensemble of a large number of spin-j indistinguishable atoms (blue dots) elongated in the x direction confined in a potential (gray area). The magnetic field (green arrows) points in the z direction and it is linear in x. Its strength is proportional to the density of the field lines.

A. Precision bound for an atomic ensemble

In an atomic ensemble of very many atoms, typically the atoms cannot be individually addressed. This can be taken into account, if we consider quantum states that are PI. Hence, we consider states for which both the internal state $\rho^{(\rm s)}$ and the probability distribution function $P(\boldsymbol{x})$, appearing in Eq. (4), are PI. The permutational invariance of $P(\boldsymbol{x})$ implies that

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}) = \tfrac{1}{N!}\sum_k \Pi_k[P(\boldsymbol{x})], \quad (53)$$

where the summation is over all possible permutations Π_k of the variables x_n. Hence, we do not need to sum over all possible n's in Eqs. (36) and (37), and neither to sum over all n's and m's in Eq. (38). All terms of each sum are equal among each other due to the permutationally invariance of the PDF Eq. (53).

An interesting property of the covariance,(38), is that it only can take values bounded by the variance in the following way,

$$\frac{-\sigma^2}{N-1} \leqslant \eta \leqslant \sigma^2, \quad (54)$$

where both the lower and the upper bounds are proportionals to the variance σ^2. Note that from Eq. (53), the minimum of the covariance will scale at most as $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$, which in principle reduces the performance of the precision with respect to the particle number. See Fig. 4 for a graphical example on how different correlations are obtained in an atomic 1D lattice.

Observation 5.— The maximal precision achievable by a single atomic ensemble insensitive to homogeneous fields is

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}|_{\max} = (\sigma^2 - \eta)\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm s)}, j_z^{(n)}]. \quad (55)$$

The precision given in Eq. (55) can be reached by an optimal measurement. Nevertheless, it is worth to note that the precision cannot surpass the shot-noise scaling because $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm s)}, j_z^{(n)}]$ cannot be larger than j^2 and η cannot be smaller than $-\sigma^2/(N-1)$, which makes its contribution negligible for large N.

Proof. First of all we show an important property of the states insensitive to the homogeneous fields. For such states $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, J_z] = 0$, which implies

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, J_z] = \sum_{n,m}^{N}\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] = 0 \quad (56)$$



FIG. 4. Possible particle distribution for a PI chain of 11 atoms depending on a 1D lattice depending on the covariance η. (top) The atoms bunch together due to high correlation in the positions. As explained in the text, this leads to the possibility of estimating well the magnetic field at each point, possibly obtaining a very good estimate of the gradient parameter. (middle) Due to the small covariance the particles fill up the sites more uniformly. (bottom) The negative correlation makes the particles be far from each other, filling the trap uniformly. All the cases recover after infinite number of measurements the chain density profile. Thus, they have the same single-particle probability density.

Hence, for such states

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}] = -\sum_{n\neq m}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \tag{57}$$

holds.

From the definition of the QFI for states insensitive to the homogeneous field, Eq. (18), we obtain the bound for a single ensemble as

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2}|_{\max} &= \sum_{n,m}^{N} \int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sigma^2 \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}] + \sum_{n\neq m}^{N} \eta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}].\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Using the Eq. (57), the Observation 5 follows. ■

Observation 6.— For states sensitive to homogeneous fields, the precision of estimating the gradient is bounded from above as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2} \leqslant (\sigma^2 - \eta) \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}] + \eta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, J_z]. \tag{59}$$

Proof. First of all, note that the second term appearing in Eq. (26) is proportional to the average of the particle position, $\int P(\boldsymbol{x}) x_n \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$, and since $P(\boldsymbol{x})$ is PI, $\int P(\boldsymbol{x}) x_n \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$ is the same for all n's and equals μ. Moreover, with the translational invariance of the precision bound we choose $\mu = 0$ so we only compute the first term in Eq. (26)

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} &\leqslant \sum_{n,m}^{N} \int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sigma^2 \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}] + \sum_{n\neq m}^{N} \eta \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}] \\ &= (\sigma^2 - \eta) \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}] + \eta \sum_{n,m}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}],\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where in the second line we compute the diagonal and the off-diagonal terms of the sum separately and in the last line we add $\eta \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho, j_z^{(n)}]$ to the last term and subtract it from the first term to make the expression more similar to Eq. (55).

The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (59) is new in the sense that it did not appear in the bound for states insensitive to homogeneous fields. Note that the bound, (59), is not necessarily saturable if there is no compatible measurement to estimate the gradient parameter and the homogeneous parameter simultaneously. This question will be discussed in AppendixD. Note also that even if the first term cannot overcome the shot-noise limit, in the second term the covariance is multiplied by QFI for estimating the homogeneous field and therefore this concrete term, for extremely correlated particle positions, allows to achieve the Heisenberg scaling. ■

B. Precision limit for various spin-states

In this section, we present the precision limits for different classes of important quantum states such as the totally polarized state, the state having the largest precision among separable states, the singlet state, the Dicke state, (52), or the GHZ state, (51). We calculate the precision bounds presented before, (55) and (59), for these systems. We show first the results for the singlet which is insensitive to homogeneous field. The rest of the results are for states sensitive to homogeneous field which in general are not necessarily achievable bounds.

1. *Singlet states*

A pure singlet state is an eigenstate of the collective J_z and J^2 operators, with an eigenvalue zero in both cases. There are many different singlet states for an ensemble of N spin-j particles, and still a great amount of them are PI. Surprisingly the precision bound we compute is the same for any PI singlet. Atomic ensembles in a singlet state have been experimentally created with cold gases [57, 58].

Observation 7.— For PI spin states living in the singlet subspace, i.e., states composed of vectors that have zero eigenvalues for J_z and J^2 and all their possible statistical mixtures, the precision of the magnetic gradient parameter is bounded from above as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{\mathrm{singlet}}|_{\max} = (\sigma^2 - \eta) N \frac{4j(j+1)}{3}. \tag{61}$$

Proof. In an N-particle system, there are several singlets pairwise orthogonal to each other. The number of such singlets, D_0, depends on the particle spin j and the number of particles N.

The most general singlet state can be written in the total angular momentum basis, using D to label the degenerate states, $|J, M_z, D\rangle$, in the following way

$$\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}} = \sum_{D=1}^{D_0} p_D |0,0,D\rangle\langle 0,0,D|, \tag{62}$$

where $\sum_D p_D{=}1$.

Looking at Eq. (55), we must compute the QFI for the one-particle operator $j_z^{(n)}$ in order to compute the precision bound for PI singlet states. With that in mind, we use the fact that when $j_z^{(n)}$ acts on a singlet state, produces a state outside of the singlet subspace. Hence,

$$\langle 0,0,D|j_z^{(n)}|0,0,D'\rangle = 0, \tag{63}$$

for any pair of pure singlet singlet states. This can immediately used to compute $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(s)}, j_z^{(n)}]$ appearing in Eq. (55). We use the alternative formula for the QFI, (15), for which the second term is obtained as

$$8 \sum_{D,D'} \frac{p_D p_{D'}}{p_D + p_{D'}} |\langle 0,0,D|j_z^{(n)}|0,0,D'\rangle|^2 = 0. \tag{64}$$

It follows that the QFI for any singlet equals the second moment of the angular momentum component

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}}, j_z^{(n)}] = 4\,\mathrm{tr}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}} (j_z^{(n)})^2]. \tag{65}$$

For the last part of the proof, we must compute the expectation value of the operator $(j_z^{(n)})^2$. Due to the rotational invariance of the singlet

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}} (j_x^{(n)})^2] = \mathrm{tr}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}} (j_y^{(n)})^2] = \mathrm{tr}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}} (j_z^{(n)})^2] \tag{66}$$

holds. We also know that

$$\langle (j_x^{(n)})^2 + (j_y^{(n)})^2 + (j_z^{(n)})^2 \rangle = j(j+1), \tag{67}$$

is valid for any state. Hence, the expectation value of $(j_z^{(n)})^2$ for the singlet is

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}} (j_z^{(n)})^2] = \frac{j(j+1)}{3}. \tag{68}$$

Inserting Eq. (68) into Eq. (65), we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\mathrm{singlet}}, j_z^{(n)}] = \frac{4j(j+1)}{3} \tag{69}$$

for any n. Using Eq. (55), the statement is proved. ■

As mentioned earlier, singlet states are insensitive to homogeneous magnetic fields, hence determining the gradient leads to a single-parameter estimation problem. This implies that there is an optimal operator that saturates the precision bound given by Eq. (61). However, it is usually very hard to find this optimal measurement, although a formal procedure for this exists [4]. In Ref. [40], a particular set-up for determining the magnetic gradient with PI singlet states was suggested by the measurement of the J_x^2 collective operator. For this scenario the precision is given by

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2} = \frac{|\partial_{b_1} \langle J_x^2 \rangle|^2}{(\Delta J_x^2)^2}. \tag{70}$$

In Appendix C, we show that this measurement actually provides, in the short-time limit, an optimal precision for gradient metrology.

2. *Totally polarized state*

The totally polarized state can easily be prepared experimentally. It has already been used for gradient magnetometry with a single atomic ensemble [18, 19]. For the gradient measurement as for the measurement of the homogeneous field, the polarization must be perpendicular to the field we want to measure. Here we chose as before the totally polarized state along y-axis, given as

$$|\psi_{\mathrm{tp}}\rangle = |j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}. \tag{71}$$

Next we will obtain the precision bound for this state. The relevant variances for Eq. (71) are

$$(\Delta J_z)^2 = Nj/2, \tag{72}$$

$$(\Delta j_z^{(n)})^2 = j/2, \tag{73}$$

for all n. Based on Eq. (16), for pure states the quantum Fisher information is just four times the variance. Hence, from Eq. (72), we obtain $F_Q[\varrho, j_z^{(n)}] = 2j$ and $F_Q[\varrho, J_z] = 2Nj$. Then, the bound on the sensitivity can be obtained from the formula for state sensitive to the homogeneous field, (59), as

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{\mathrm{tp}} \leqslant 2\sigma^2 Nj. \tag{74}$$

We can see clearly that the precision scales as $\mathcal{O}(N)$, for large N.

Let us now see, which measurement could be used to estimate the field gradient with a totally polarized state. The homogeneous field rotates all spins by the same angle, while the gradient rotates the spin at different positions by a different angles. Due to that, the homogeneous field rotates the collective spin, but does not change its absolute value. On the other hand, the field gradient decreases the absolute value of the spin, since it has been prepared to be maximal, which has been used in Ref. [43] for gradient magnetometry, see Fig. III.

3. *The best separable state*

We now turn our attention to the precision bound for all separable spin-states. It is useful to obtain this value so we have a direct comparison on what the best classically achievable precision is. It turns out that for $j > \frac{1}{2}$, it is possible to achieve a precision higher than with the fully polarized state (71).

We do not know if the optimal separable state is sensitive or insensitive to the homogeneous field. The corresponding precision bounds for the gradient estimation are given in Eq. (18) and Eq. (26), respectively. Nevertheless, when moving the system to the origin of the coordinates, we have

$$\int x_n P(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = 0, \tag{75}$$

for all n due to the permutational invariance of $P(\boldsymbol{x})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{01}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{10}$, defined in Eq. (30), are equal to 0 as well. Hence the two bounds, (18) and (26), are the same in this case, which we now rewrite for clarity

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{\mathrm{sep}} \leqslant \sum_{n,m} \int x_n x_m P(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}]. \tag{76}$$

Due to the convexity of the QFI, we can now find the best separable state, which has to be pure and has to maximize $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm s)}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}]$. For product states we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[\rho^{(\rm s)}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}]$ equals 0 if $n \neq m$, and $4(\Delta j_z^{(n)})^2$ if $n = m$. Hence, a state that maximizes $(\Delta j_z^{(n)})^2$ is

$$|\psi_{\rm sep}\rangle = \left(\tfrac{|-j\rangle+|+j\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\otimes N}, \tag{77}$$

where we have $(\Delta j_z^{(n)})^2 = j^2$ for the variance.

This state is sensitive to the homogeneous field since $[|\psi_{\rm sep}\rangle\langle\psi_{\rm sep}|, J_z] \neq 0$. Based on these, the precision bound for separable states is

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{\rm sep} &\leqslant \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int x_n^2 P(\boldsymbol{x})\, {\rm d}\boldsymbol{x}\, 4(\Delta j_z^{(n)})^2 \\ &= 4\sigma^2 N j^2,\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where we have used the definition of the variance of the particle positions, (37), for a permutational invariant state .

Note that the bound for the singlet state, (61), is above the bound for the totally polarized state given in Eq. (74) but below of the bound defined for the best separable state (77). Nevertheless when the singlet state is used, the homogeneous magnetic field has no effect on the state. Thus, the measurement of a single operator is needed and the bound can be saturated with an optimal estimator for the gradient field.

4. *The unpolarized Dicke states* $|{\rm D}_N\rangle$ *and* $|{\rm D}_N\rangle_x$

Next, we compute precision bounds for entangled states. In this section, we consider unpolarized Dicke states, which play an important role in quantum optics and quantum information science. The Dicke state $|{\rm D}_N\rangle_l$, (52), with a maximal $\langle J_x^2 + J_y^2 + J_z^2\rangle$ and $\langle J_l\rangle = 0$ for any $l \in x, y, z$ is particularly interesting due to its entanglement properties and its metrological usefulness. This state has been created in photonic experiments [59–61] and in cold atoms [62, 63], while a Dicke state with $\langle J_z\rangle > 0$ has been created with cold trapped ions [64].

The Dicke state $|{\rm D}_N\rangle$ is an eigenstate of J_z so insensitive to homogeneous magnetic field pointing into the z-direction, thus the precision can be saturate by some measurement. Whereas, the Dicke state $|{\rm D}_N\rangle_x$ is sensitive to the homogeneous field. Moreover it is very useful for estimating the homogeneous field as it has been shown in Ref. [62]. Here we consider large particle numbers, to make the results simpler.

Observation 8.— For large N, the precision bound for the Dicke state $|{\rm D}_N\rangle$ is

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{\rm D}|_{\max} = (\sigma^2 - \eta)N, \tag{79}$$

whereas for the Dicke state $|{\rm D}_N\rangle_x$, which is sensitive to homogeneous fields, the precision is bounded from above by

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{{\rm D},x} \leqslant (\sigma^2 - \eta)N + \eta\frac{N(N+2)}{2}, \tag{80}$$

which shows in principle a Heisenberg limit behavior in the second term on the right-hand side.

Proof. Let us prove first Eq. (79). Since $|{\rm D}_N\rangle$ is a pure state, the QFIs appearing in Eqs. (55) are simply four times the corresponding variances of $j_z^{(n)}$. For the expectation values of the single-partcile angular momentum components,

$$\langle j_l^{(n)}\rangle = 0 \tag{81}$$

hold for $l = x, y, z$ for all n. The second moments of the collective angular momentum components are given as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle J_x^2\rangle = \langle J_y^2\rangle &= \frac{N}{4}\left(\frac{N}{2}+1\right), \\ \langle J_z^2\rangle &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

Since the Dicke state is PI, we have

$$\langle j_l^{(n)} j_l^{(m)}\rangle = \langle j_l^{(1)} j_l^{(2)}\rangle, \quad \langle (j_l^{(n)})^2\rangle = \langle (j_l^{(1)})^2\rangle \tag{83}$$

for all $m \neq n$ and $l = x, y, z$. The collective second moments are connected to the single particle and two-particle operator expectation values as

$$\langle J_l^2\rangle = N\langle (j_l^{(1)})^2\rangle + N(N-1)\langle j_l^{(1)} j_l^{(2)}\rangle \tag{84}$$

for $l = x, y, z$. Considering the symmetry under rotations around z axis, we also have $\langle (j_x^{(1)})^2\rangle = \langle (j_y^{(1)})^2\rangle$, $\langle j_x^{(1)} j_x^{(2)}\rangle = \langle j_y^{(1)} j_y^{(2)}\rangle$. Based on these and using Eq. (67) for $j = 1/2$, we arrive at [40]

$$\langle (j_l^{(n)})^2\rangle = \frac{1}{4} \tag{85}$$

for $l = x, y, z$. With this, $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|{\rm D}_N\rangle, j_z^{(n)}] = 4(\Delta j_z^{(n)^2}) = 1$ follows. From Eq. (55) and with $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|{\rm D}_N\rangle, j_z^{(n)}] = 1$, the proof for the homogeneous insensitive Dicke state $|{\rm D}_N\rangle$ holds.

Let us prove now Eq. (80). The second moments $\langle (j_z^{(n)})^2\rangle$ for $|{\rm D}_N\rangle_x$ can be obtained from the second moments computed above for $|{\rm D}_N\rangle$ by relabeling the coordinate axes. Hence, we obtain again $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|{\rm D}_N\rangle, j_z^{(n)}] = 1$. Finally, with $\mathcal{F}_{\rm Q}[|{\rm D}_N\rangle_x, J_z] = N(N+2)/2$ and using Eq. (59) we have all we need to prove Observation 8. ■

5. *The GHZ state*

The Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state is also highly entangled and plays an important role in quantum information theory [65]. They have been created experimentally in photonic systems [66–68] and trapped ions [69, 70].

The GHZ state is defined for qubits in Eq. (51). This state is very sensitive to the homogeneous field. On the other hand, as shown in Appendix D, for this state the optimal estimators for the homogeneous field and the gradient field are compatible. It means that both parameters can be estimated at once. Hence, in this case, the bound given in Eq. (59) can be saturated by some measurement set-up. In order to calculate this bound explicitly, let us recall that for pure states the QFI is simplified using Eq. (16). In the GHZ state the expectation value of $j_z^{(n)}$ and J_z are equal to 0. Whereas, the second moments are $\langle (j_z^{(n)})^2\rangle = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\langle J_z^2\rangle = \frac{N^2}{4}$, hence we obtain the following result

$$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}_{\rm GHZ}|_{\max} = (\sigma^2 - \eta)N + \eta N^2. \tag{86}$$

This means that we can reach the Heisenberg-limit with such states, but only in cases where η is positive, i.e., when the particles are spatially correlated.

States	$(\Delta b_1)^{-2}$
ρ_{singlet}	$\mid_{\max} = (\sigma^2-\eta)N4j(j+1)/3$
$\lvert j\rangle_y^{\otimes N}$	$\leqslant 2\sigma^2 Nj$
$\lvert\psi_{\text{sep}}\rangle$	$\leqslant 4\sigma^2 Nj^2$
$\lvert \text{D}_N\rangle$	$\mid_{\max} = (\sigma^2-\eta)N$
$\lvert \text{D}_N\rangle_x$	$\leqslant (\sigma^2-\eta)N + \eta N(N+2)/2$
$\lvert\text{GHZ}\rangle$	$\mid_{\max} = \sigma^2 N + \eta N^2$

TABLE II. Precision bounds for differential magnetometry for various quantum states defined in the main text. In the case in which a simultaneous measurement is possible to estimate the homogeneous and gradient magnetic fields, then the "$\mid_{\max}$" subscript is used instead of the inequality "$\leqslant$".

6. *Summary of results*

Finally, we summarize the precision bounds obtained for various quantum states in Table II. In Fig. 5, we show the mean values and variances of the collective angular momentum components for these states.



FIG. 5. Angular momentum components $(\langle J_x\rangle, \langle J_y\rangle, \langle J_z\rangle)$ (red vector) and their variances (green ellipse) for various quantum states defined in the main text. The radius of the sphere is the maximal angular momentum, $r = Nj$. There are represented different spin states for few particles, namely, singlet state (a), Dicke state (b), state totally polarized in the y direction (c), Dicke state in the x direction (d), and the GHZ state (e).

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have investigated the precision limits for measuring the gradient of a magnetic field with atomic ensembles arranged in different geometries and initialized in different states. In particular, we studied spin-chain configurations as well as the case of two atomic ensembles localized at two different positions, and also the experimentally relevant set-up of a single atomic ensemble with an arbitrary density profile of the atoms was considered. We discussed the usefulness of various quantum states for measuring the field strength and the gradient. Some quantum states, such as singlet states, are insensitive to the homogeneous field. Using these states, it is possible to estimate the gradient with saturate the bound, while for states that are sensitive to the homogeneous magnetic field, compatible measurements are needed to estimate the homogeneous and gradient field in order to saturate the bounds. For spin chains and the two-ensemble case, the precision of the estimation of the gradient can reach the Heisenberg limit. For the single ensemble case, only if strong correlation between the particles is allowed can the shot-noise limit be surpassed and even the Heisenberg limit be achieved. However, even if the Heisenberg limit is not reached, single-ensemble methods can have a huge practical advantage compared to methods based on two or more atomic ensembles, since using a single ensemble makes the experiment simpler and can also result in a better spatial resolution.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank J. Calsamiglia, G. Colangelo, R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, I. L. Egusquiza, O. Gühne, S. Altenburg, S. Wölk, C. Klempt, M. W. Mitchell, M. Modugno, L. Santos, R. J. Sewell, and A. Smerzi, for stimulating discussions. We acknowledge the support of the EU (ERC 577 Starting Grant 258647/GEDENTQOPT, ERC Consolidator 578 Grant 683107/TempoQ, CHIST-ERA QUASAR, Marie Curie 579 CIG 293993/ENFOQI, COST Action CA15220), the Span- 580 ish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness 581 and the European Regional Development Fund FEDER 582 through Grant No. FIS2015-67161-P (MINECO/FEDER), 583 the Basque Government (Project No. IT986-16), the OTKA 584 (Contract No. K83858), and the UPV/EHU program UFI 11/55. I. U.-L. acknowledges the support of a Ph.D. grant of the Basque Government.

Appendix A: Spatial state of a thermally distributed point-like particles

We discuss the spatial state represented by Eq. (4). For that, let us introduce the position operator as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = \int \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\langle\boldsymbol{x}|\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \tag{A1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a vector of the particle positions, and $|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle$ denotes a spatial state in which the point-like particles are at given positions with the usual normalization

$$\langle\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}\rangle = \delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}), \tag{A2}$$

as expected. Based on Eq. (A1), we see that

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle = \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle. \tag{A3}$$

Thus, $|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the operator $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$. In order to obtain a quantum state that represents N point-like particles placed in the locations determined by the $\boldsymbol{x}$ vector, we have to normalize it as

$$|\varphi_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rangle = \frac{|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle}}. \tag{A4}$$

From Eq. (A4) and using that there is a probability distribution function, $P(\boldsymbol{x})$, which describes the probabilities of that the point-like particles are at the positions given by $\boldsymbol{x}$, we arrive at Eq. (4).

Appendix B: Calculation of the QFI matrix elements for point-like particles

For computing the QFI, which is written in terms of the eigen-decomposition of the state and the operators H_1 or H_0, we have that when the spatial part of the state is written as Eq. (4) some simplifications arise.

For that let us write first the density matrix on its complete eigenbasis

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \int \frac{P(\boldsymbol{x})}{\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\langle\boldsymbol{x}|\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\otimes\sum_{\lambda} p_\lambda|\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda| \\ &= \int\sum_{\lambda}\frac{P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\lambda}{\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle}|\boldsymbol{x},\lambda\rangle\langle\boldsymbol{x},\lambda|\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x},\end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

where clearly $P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\lambda/\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle$ are the eigenvalues. Hence, the quantum Fisher information matrix elements are written in the following way based on Eq. (11),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\varrho,H_i,H_j] = 2\int\sum_{\lambda,\nu}\frac{1}{\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle}\frac{(P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\lambda - P(\boldsymbol{y})p_\nu)^2}{P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\lambda + P(\boldsymbol{y})p_\nu} \\ \times (H_i)_{\boldsymbol{x},\lambda;\boldsymbol{y},\nu}(H_j)_{\boldsymbol{y},\nu;\boldsymbol{x},\lambda}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y}.\end{aligned} \tag{B2}$$

Note that $\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{x}\rangle \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{y}\rangle$ and that the integral is over $2N$ variables, $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$.

We now use the fact that the generators H_0 and H_1 are diagonal in the spatial basis, see Eqs. (28) and (22). Hence, the matrix elements can be rewritten as

$$(H_i)_{\boldsymbol{x},\lambda;\boldsymbol{y},\nu} \equiv \delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y})(\mathcal{H}_i)_{\lambda,\nu}, \tag{B3}$$

for $i=0,1$, where $\mathcal{H}_i$ is a shorthand for $\sum_{n=1}^{N} j_z^{(n)}$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{N} x_n j_z^{(n)}$, respectively. Using $\langle \boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}\rangle = \delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y})$ and Eq. (B3), we write Eq. (B2) as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho,H_i,H_j] &= 2\int\sum_{\lambda,\nu}\frac{(P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\lambda - P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\nu)^2}{P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\lambda + P(\boldsymbol{x})p_\nu} \\ &\quad\times(\mathcal{H}_i)_{\lambda,\nu}(\mathcal{H}_j)_{\nu,\lambda}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \\ &= 2\int\sum_{\lambda,\nu}P(\boldsymbol{x})\frac{(p_\lambda-p_\nu)^2}{p_\lambda+p_\nu} \\ &\quad\times(\mathcal{H}_i)_{\lambda,\nu}(\mathcal{H}_j)_{\nu,\lambda}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

which using the definition Eq. (11) for $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}, j_z^{(n)}, j_z^{(m)}]$ simplifies to Eqs. (18), (27), (29) and (30) depending on the case.

Appendix C: Optimal measurements for singlet states

In this Appendix, we prove that the precision limits for gradient metrology can be saturated for singlet states if we measure J_x^2.

Observation 9.—Let the initial spin state of an atomic ensemble be an arbitrary PI singlet state $\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}_{\text{singlet}}$. Consider the experimental set-up when b_1 is obtained by measuring J_x^2. The precision of b_1 in this measurement is optimal in the short-time limit, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{|\partial_{b_1}\langle J_x^2(t)\rangle|^2}{\langle J_x^4(t)\rangle - \langle J_x^2(t)\rangle^2} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Q}}[\varrho^{(\mathrm{s})},H_1,H_1]. \tag{C1}$$

Proof. Recall that in our set-up the time-evolution unitary operator is of the form $U(t) = e^{-ib_1H_1}$ with $b_1 = \gamma B_1 t/\hbar$. Let us first simplify the short-time limit for the precision of the measurement, which is given by

$$\lim_{t\to 0}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} = \lim_{t\to 0}\frac{|\partial_{b_1}\langle J_x^2(t)\rangle|^2}{\langle J_x^4(t)\rangle - \langle J_x^2(t)\rangle^2}, \tag{C2}$$

where $J_x^k(t) = U^\dagger(t)J_x^kU(t)$ for any power of k. Since $\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}J_x^2 = J_x^2\rho^{(\mathrm{s})} = 0$, we have that for $t\to 0$ the expectation values $\langle J_x^2(0)\rangle = \langle J_x^4(0)\rangle = 0$ and we also obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{t\to 0}|\partial_{b_1}\langle J_x^2(t)\rangle|^2 = \\ &= |\lim_{t\to 0}\mathrm{tr}\left(\partial_{b_1}\left[e^{ib_1H_1}J_x^2e^{-ib_1H_1}\right]\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}\right)|^2 \\ &= |\,\mathrm{tr}\left(iH_1J_x^2\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}\right) - \mathrm{tr}\left(iH_1\rho^{(\mathrm{s})}J_x^2\right)|^2 = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

So this means that both the numerator and denominator of the right-hand-side of Eq. (C2) go to zero as $t\to 0$, thus the l'Hospital rule can be used applying the derivative ∂_{b_1} in both, the denominator and the numerator,

$$\lim_{t\to 0}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} = \lim_{t\to 0}\frac{2\langle\partial_{b_1}^2J_x^2(t)\rangle\langle\partial_{b_1}J_x^2(t)\rangle}{\langle\partial_{b_1}J_x^4(t)\rangle - 2\langle J_x^2(t)\rangle\langle\partial_{b_1}J_x^2(t)\rangle}. \tag{C4}$$

However, here the numerator and the denominator are again zero at $t=0$, so we employ the l'Hospital rule once again,

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{t\to 0}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} = \\ &= \lim_{t\to 0}\frac{2\langle\partial_{b_1}^2J_x^2(t)\rangle^2 2\langle\partial_{b_1}^3J_x^2(t)\rangle\langle\partial_{b_1}J_x^2(t)\rangle}{\langle\partial_{b_1}^2J_x^4(t)\rangle - 2\langle\partial_{b_1}J_x^2(t)\rangle^2 - \langle J_x^2(t)\rangle\langle\partial_{b_1}^2J_x^2(t)\rangle} \\ &= \lim_{t\to 0}\frac{2\langle\partial_{b_1}^2J_x^2(t)\rangle^2}{\langle\partial_{b_1}^2J_x^4(t)\rangle} = \frac{4\langle H_1J_x^2H_1\rangle^2}{\langle H_1J_x^4H_1\rangle}.\end{aligned} \tag{C5}$$

From $J_x^2\rho^{(\mathrm{s})} = \rho^{(\mathrm{s})}J_x^2 = 0$, one can identify the following equalities $\langle H_1J_x^2H_1\rangle = \langle H[J_x^2,H_1]\rangle$ and therefore $\langle H_1J_x^4H_1\rangle = \langle[H_1,J_x^2][J_x^2,H_1]\rangle$. Thus the problem is reduced to calculating the commutator $[J_x^2,H_1]$. First of all, we compute $[J_x^2, j_z^{(n)}]$ in the following way

$$[J_x^2, j_z^{(n)}] = -2iJ_xj_y^{(n)} - j_z^{(n)} = -2ij_y^{(n)}J_x + j_z^{(n)}. \tag{C6}$$

For compute the commutator $[J_x^2,H_1]$ we use in a straightforward way the Eq. (C6)

$$[J_x^2,H_1] = -2iJ_xH_1^{(y)}J_x - H_1 = -2iH_1^{(y)}J_x + H_1, \tag{C7}$$

where $H_1^{(y)} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} x^{(n)}j_y^{(n)}$. By this we arrive at the following equality for any singlet state $\langle H_1J_x^2H_1\rangle^2 = \langle H_1^2\rangle^2$ and so we can use it in Eq. (C5). In the same way we can insert the following for the denominator in the Eq. (C5), $\langle[H_1,J_x^2][J_x^2,H_1]\rangle = \langle H_1^2\rangle$, hence $\lim_{t\to 0}(\Delta b_1)^{-2} = 4\langle H_1^2\rangle$. For any PI singlet of the form Eq. (62) and spatial state Eq. (4) we can compute that $\langle H_1^2\rangle = \frac{4Nj(j+1)}{3}(\sigma^2-\eta)$, so the proof holds. ∎

Appendix D: Compatibility of measurements

When working with a state that is sensitive to the homogeneous field, in order to optimally estimate the gradient, one

must find measure simultaneously the gradient and the homogeneous field. In other words, the optimal measurement for the homogeneous field and for the gradient parameter should commute. The necessary condition for being able to construct compatible measurements to estimate b_0 and b_1 is that the symmetric logarithmic derivative, SLD, of the two parameters commute, see Ref. [4]

$$[L_0, L_1] = 0, \tag{D1}$$

where L_0 and L_1 are the SLD with respect to each of the parameters b_0 and b_1.

Hence for unitary evolution of the type Eq. (7), and for states written as Eqs. (3) and (4), we obtain the SLDs as [4]

$$L_i = 2i \sum_{\lambda \neq \nu} \frac{p_\lambda - p_\nu}{p_\lambda + p_\nu} \langle \lambda | H_i | \nu \rangle |\lambda\rangle\langle\nu|, \tag{D2}$$

where $\rho^{(\mathrm{s})} = \sum_\lambda p_\lambda |\lambda\rangle\langle\lambda|$ is the eigendecomposition of the spin state. For a pure spin state Eq. (D2) becomes

$$L_i = 2 \sum_\lambda \left\{ i \langle \lambda | H_i | \psi \rangle |\lambda\rangle\langle\psi| + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \tag{D3}$$

Finally, the commutator of the SLDs can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}[L_0, L_1] =& 4\big\{ (H_1 - \langle H_1 \rangle)[H_0, \rho^{(\mathrm{s})}] \\ & - (H_0 - \langle H_0 \rangle)[H_1, \rho^{(\mathrm{s})}] \big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{D4}$$

For states sensitive to the homogeneous field, it is possible to find a simultaneous measurement which saturates the bound on the precision of the gradient field, (26), if the Eq. (D4) is equal to 0.

It is illustrative to apply Eq. (D4) to the GHZ state, (51), dicussed in Eq. IV. We will denote the GHZ state by $|\psi\rangle$ for brevity. In order to compute Eq. (D4) for our case, first we have to know that the H_i's act on the GHZ state as

$$H_0|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} j_z^{(n)} |\psi\rangle = N \tfrac{1}{2} |\widetilde{\psi}\rangle, \tag{D5a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_1|\psi\rangle &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} x^{(n)} j_z^{(n)} |\psi\rangle \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} x^{(n)} j |\widetilde{\psi}\rangle = N X \tfrac{1}{2} |\widetilde{\psi}\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{D5b}$$

where X is the collective average-position operator $X := \sum_n x^{(n)}/N$. Moreover, $|\widetilde{\psi}\rangle$ represents a state proportional to $j_z^{(n)}|\psi\rangle$ given as

$$|\widetilde{\psi}\rangle = \frac{|11\cdots11\rangle - |00\cdots00\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{D6}$$

Now since $\langle H_0 \rangle = \langle H_1 \rangle = 0$ for the GHZ state, we write the commutator relation defined in Eq. (D4) as

$$\begin{aligned}[L_0, L_1] &= 4(H_1[H_0, |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|] - H_0[H_1, |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|]) \\ &= 4(H_1|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|H_0 - H_0|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|H_1) \\ &= X|\widetilde{\psi}\rangle\langle\widetilde{\psi}|N - N|\widetilde{\psi}\rangle\langle\widetilde{\psi}|X \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{D7}$$

Hence, we proved that the precision bound, (26), can be saturated for the GHZ state.

[1] M. Glaser and M. Kochsiek, *Handbook of Metrology* (John Wiley & Sons, 2010).
[2] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Science **306**, 1330 (2004).
[3] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010401 (2006).
[4] M. G. A. Paris, International Journal of Quantum Information **7**, 125 (2009).
[5] C. Gross, J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys. **45**, 103001 (2012).
[6] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 5138 (1993).
[7] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 67 (1994).
[8] A. Sørensen, L.-M. Duan, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Nature **409**, 63 (2001).
[9] J. Ma, X. Wang, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, Phys. Rep. **509**, 89 (2011).
[10] A. Kuzmich, N. P. Bigelow, and L. Mandel, Europhys. Lett. **42**, 481 (1998).
[11] A. Louchet-Chauvet, J. Appel, J. J. Renema, D. Oblak, N. Kjaergaard, and E. S. Polzik, New J. Phys. **12**, 065032 (2010).
[12] J. Borregaard and A. S. Sørensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 090801 (2013).
[13] E. M. Kessler, P. Kómár, M. Bishof, L. Jiang, A. S. Sørensen, J. Ye, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 190403 (2014).
[14] W. Wasilewski, K. Jensen, H. Krauter, J. J. Renema, M. V. Balabas, and E. S. Polzik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 133601 (2010).
[15] K. Eckert, P. Hyllus, D. Bruss, U. V. Poulsen, M. Lewenstein, C. Jentsch, T. Müller, E. Rasel, and W. Ertmer, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 013814 (2006).
[16] S. Wildermuth, S. Hofferberth, I. Lesanovsky, S. Groth, P. Krüger, J. Schmiedmayer, and I. Bar-Joseph, Appl. Phys. Lett. **88**, 264103 (2006).
[17] F. Wolfgramm, A. Cere, F. A. Beduini, A. Predojević, M. Koschorreck, and M. W. Mitchell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 053601 (2010).
[18] M. Koschorreck, M. Napolitano, B. Dubost, and M. W. Mitchell, Appl. Phys. Lett. **98**, 074101 (2011).
[19] M. Vengalattore, J. M. Higbie, S. R. Leslie, J. Guzman, L. E. Sadler, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 200801 (2007).
[20] M.-K. Zhou, Z.-K. Hu, X.-C. Duan, B.-L. Sun, J.-B. Zhao, and J. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 061602 (2010).
[21] R. Schnabel, N. Mavalvala, D. E. McClelland, and P. K. Lam, Nat. Commun. **1**, 121 (2010).
[22] The LIGO Scientific Collaboration *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **7**, 962 (2011).
[23] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, K. Banaszek, and R. Schnabel, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 041802 (2013).
[24] A. Monras and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012315 (2011).
[25] C. Vaneph, T. Tufarelli, and M. G. Genoni, Quantum Measurements and Quantum Metrology **1**, 12 (2013).
[26] S. I. Knysh and G. A. Durkin, Preprint , arXiv:1307.0470 (2013).
[27] K. Matsumoto, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 3111 (2002).
[28] T. Baumgratz and A. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 030801

(2016).
[29] M. Szczykulska, T. Baumgratz, and A. Datta, Advances in Physics: X **1**, 621 (2016).
[30] P. C. Humphreys, M. Barbieri, A. Datta, and I. A. Walmsley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 070403 (2013).
[31] M. Skotiniotis, P. Sekatski, and W. Dür, New J. Phys. **17**, 073032 (2015).
[32] P. A. Knott, T. J. Proctor, A. J. Hayes, J. F. Ralph, P. Kok, and J. A. Dunningham, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 062312 (2016).
[33] P. J. D. Crowley, A. Datta, M. Barbieri, and I. A. Walmsley, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 023845 (2014). See also Ref. [71] for a related problem of phase estimation in the presence of losses, when the loss is known.
[71] M. Landini, M. Fattori, L. Pezzè, and A. Smerzi, New J. Phys. **16**, 113074 (2014).
[35] J. K. Stockton, X. Wu, and M. A. Kasevich, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 033613 (2007).
[36] D. S. Durfee, Y. K. Shaham, and M. A. Kasevich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 240801 (2006).
[37] M. Snadden, J. McGuirk, P. Bouyer, K. Haritos, and M. Kasevich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 971 (1998).
[38] J. B. Fixler, G. Foster, J. McGuirk, and M. Kasevich, Science **315**, 74 (2007).
[39] S. Altenburg, S. Wlk, G. Tóth, and O. Ghne, Phys. Rev. A **94** (2016), 10.1103/physreva.94.052306.
[40] I. Urizar-Lanz, P. Hyllus, I. L. Egusquiza, M. W. Mitchell, and G. Tóth, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 013626 (2013).
[41] Y.-L. Zhang, H. Wang, L. Jing, L.-Z. Mu, and H. Fan, Sci. Rep. **4**, 7390 (2014).
[42] H. Ng and K. Kim, Opt. Commun. **331**, 353 (2014).
[43] N. Behbood, F. Martin Ciurana, G. Colangelo, M. Napolitano, M. W. Mitchell, and R. J. Sewell, Appl. Phys. Lett. **102**, 173504 (2013).
[44] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
[45] A. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).
[46] C. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, 1976).
[47] D. Petz, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 929 (2002).
[48] D. Petz, *Quantum information theory and quantum statistics* (Springer, Berlin, Heilderberg, 2008).
[49] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[50] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[51] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Phys. Rep. **474**, 1 (2009).
[52] Our method could be easily extended to the case of Bose-Einstein condensates, not considered in this paper. In that case, the spatial state of the system would be written as a product of a single-particle pure state as $\rho^{(\mathrm{x})} = (|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)^{\otimes N}$, where $|\Psi\rangle$ is a spatial single-particle state.
[53] S. Ragy, M. Jarzyna, and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 052108 (2016).
[54] B. Julsgaard, A. Kozhekin, and E. S. Polzik, Nature **413**, 400 (2001).
[55] G. Tóth and I. Apellaniz, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 424006 (2014).
[56] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, **58**, 1131 (1990).
[57] G. Tóth and M. W. Mitchell, New J. Phys. **12**, 053007 (2010).
[58] N. Behbood, F. Martin Ciurana, G. Colangelo, M. Napolitano, G. Tóth, R. J. Sewell, and M. W. Mitchell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 093601 (2014).
[59] N. Kiesel, C. Schmid, G. Tóth, E. Solano, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 063604 (2007).
[60] W. Wieczorek, R. Krischek, N. Kiesel, P. Michelberger, G. Tóth, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 020504 (2009).
[61] A. Chiuri, C. Greganti, M. Paternostro, G. Vallone, and P. Mataloni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 173604 (2012).
[62] B. Lücke, M. Scherer, J. Kruse, L. Pezzè, F. Deuretzbacher, P. Hyllus, J. Peise, W. Ertmer, J. Arlt, L. Santos, A. Smerzi, and C. Klempt, Science **334**, 773 (2011).
[63] C. Hamley, C. Gerving, T. Hoang, E. Bookjans, and M. Chapman, Nat. Phys. **8**, 305 (2012).
[64] H. Hffner, W. Hnsel, C. F. Roos, J. Benhelm, D. C. al kar, M. Chwalla, T. Krber, U. D. Rapol, M. Riebe, P. O. Schmidt, C. Becher, O. Ghne, W. Dr, and R. Blatt, Nature **438**, 643 (2005).
[65] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, "Going beyond bell's theorem," in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1989) pp. 69–72.
[66] J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, Nature **403**, 515 (2000).
[67] X.-C. Yao, T.-X. Wang, P. Xu, H. Lu, G.-S. Pan, X.-H. Bao, C.-Z. Peng, C.-Y. Lu, Y.-A. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, Nat. Photonics **6**, 225 (2012).
[68] C.-Y. Lu, X.-Q. Zhou, O. Gühne, W.-B. Gao, J. Zhang, Z.-S. Yuan, A. Goebel, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, Nat. Phys. **3**, 91 (2007).
[69] C. Sackett, D. Kielpinski, B. King, C. Langer, V. Meyer, C. Myatt, M. Rowe, Q. Turchette, W. Itano, D. Wineland, and C. Monroe, Nature **404**, 256 (2000).
[70] T. Monz, P. Schindler, J. T. Barreiro, M. Chwalla, D. Nigg, W. A. Coish, M. Harlander, W. Hänsel, M. Hennrich, and R. Blatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 130506 (2011).
[71] J. Kołodyński and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 053804 (2010).